## II. DECISION SHEET

Based on a consideration of the analysis contained in the final environmental impact statement (EIS) and the attached decision information, the following is my decision regarding the Federal Subsistence Management Program (FSMP) for public lands in Alaska. In Sections B-F below the decision options numbered 1-4 correspond to elements within Alternatives in the EIS (e.g., B-1 is the board structure from Alternative I in the EIS).

A.	Alternative P	Plans			
A-1.	Alternative I	Minimal change from the State program	40		
A-2.	Alternative II	Independent agency management	200		
A-3.	Alternative III	Local involvement	30		
A-4.	Alternative IV	Flexible program to meet user needs			
В.	Board Struct	Shan advisory communes would be used.			
B-1.	The Board wou	ald consist of 6 members: 5 Federal managers and a chair.	0-2		
B-2.		ld be established, each agency would operate independently ents of mutual agreement.	E-Q		
B-3.	The Board would have 16 members: a chair, one State representative, 12 subsistence users and 2 "at large" members.				
B-4.	The Board would have 6 members: 5 Federal managers and a chair. Eight regional liaisons and a liaison from the State of Alaska would be consultants to the Board.				
B-5.		uld have 6 members: 5 Federal managers and a chair. Ten is and a liaison from the State of Alaska would be consultants			
B-6.	Other				

	Regional Councils	
1.	The 6 State Regional Advisory Councils would be used and the existing geographical boundaries would be recognized.	
2.	Each agency would have its own regional structure based on conservation system units (total up to 36) and its own Regional Councils.	interest
3.	There would be 12 Federal Regional Councils established by subsistence use area.	-
4.	There would be 8 Federal Regional Councils.	
5.	There would be 10 Federal Regional Councils.	-A
5.	Other	-A
	Alternative IV. Flexible program to meet user needs	
	Local Advisory Committees	
1.	State advisory committees would be used.	-
2.	State advisory committees would be used and/or Federal local advisory	1-8
	committees formed as needed.	
3.		8-2
3. 4.	committees formed as needed.  Many Federal Committees would be formed as needed, potentially one per	8-2

	Communities would be aggregated then population and community characteristic tests would be applied to determine the status of a particular community or area. Generally a community or area with fewer than 2,500 people would be presumed rural and a community or area with more than 7,000 would be presumed non-rural. No presumption of status would exist for communities or areas between 2,500 and 7,000 in population.	
	Determinations would be based only on population. Communities with greater than 7,000 residents would be non-rural. A 5-year waiting period would be required before any community would lose rural status.	
	Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Ketchikan would be the only non-rural communities.	
	Rural determinations would be made based on aggregated population and community characteristics steps described in the EIS. Generally a community or area with fewer than 2,500 people would be presumed rural and a community or area with more than 7,000 would be presumed non-rural. No presumption of rural status would be made for communities or areas between 2,500 and 7,000 in population (as in Alternative I).	
le di ali	Rural determinations would be made based on aggregated population and community characteristics steps described in the EIS (as in Alternatives I and IV). Generally a community or area with fewer than 2,500 people would be presumed rural and a community or area with more than 7,000 would be presumed non-rural. No presumption of rural status would be made for communities or areas between 2,500 and 7,000 in population. A 5-year grace or transition period would be required before any community would lose rural status.	
	Other	

## DECISION

would be made by the Board after considering recommendations of the Regional Councils.
Other
Deserminations would be based only on population. Communities with greater than 7,000 residents would be con-rural. A 5-year watering period
Regulation Process
Proposals from all sources would be submitted to the Board, which would distribute them to the public, Regional Councils, and Local Advisory Committees for comment. Recommendations to the Board by the Regional Councils would be used during the Board's review of proposals.
The Regional Councils would develop proposals and review and evaluate proposals from other sources. Recommendations from the Regional Councils would be forwarded to the appropriate agency for action.
Local Advisory Committees would develop proposals and review and evaluate proposals prior to Regional Council review and Board action. Proposals by Local Advisory Committees would be presented to the Regional Councils for review, evaluation, and recommendation to the Board.
The Regional Councils would develop proposals, and review and evaluate proposals from other sources. Recommendations from the Regional Councils would be forwarded to the Board for action.
Other